

REMARKS

I. Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 under Section 112, second paragraph for being narrative and indefinite. Among other things, the Examiner objected to the use of weaving rather than knitting terms, given that the invention is directed to a knitting process. Applicants have canceled Claims 1-2 without prejudice or disclaimer, amended Claims 3 and 4, and provided new Claim 5. Applicants have used in the pending claims knitting terms, and have otherwise sought to address the Examiner's Section 112 rejections.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 112 rejections have been overcome.

II. Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 as being anticipated by Mednick. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 5 and amended Claims 3 and 4, which depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over Mednick.

In this regard, independent Claim 5 recites in a more detailed fashion the particular steps in the knitting process of the present invention. With respect to the fabric section that is formed using this process, the steps include: (a) knitting a plurality of warps into multiple loops in series; (b) knitting each of the plurality of warps with at least two wefts; (c) knitting a first one of the plurality of wefts and a second of the plurality of

wefts from top to bottom to substantially form a figure 8; and (d) knitting the wefts through the warps in a lateral direction. The trimming section, as claimed in Claim 5, is continuous with and below the fabric section and is formed by passing the wefts through the warps to form a plurality of braids. Support for this Amendment may be found in the Specification. See, e.g., Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments, p. 3, lines 9-23.

This combination of steps is not present in Mednick. For example, Claim 5 provides that in the fabric section, each warp is knitted with at least two wefts. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Mednick discloses this feature, with the reference number 26 being the second of the two wefts. However, Applicant respectfully submits that reference number 26 in Mednick refers to a “fringe thread” which, as shown in Figures 1 and 10, is limited to the fringe or trim area and is not part of a fabric section as claimed herein. Mednick also does not disclose, among other things, the forming of the braids by passing the wefts through the warps, and instead shows braids formed solely with the fringe threads 26.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment, including the amendments to the Claims and in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-5 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore earnestly solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance with respect to these claims.

If there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account No. 18-0002.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Weiss (Reg. No. 45,207) for
Steven M. Rabin (Reg. No. 29,102)
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
(Customer No. 23995)
Telephone: (202)371-8976
Telefax: (202)408-0924

JW:QZ:tz